

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 26 2009

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF REVIEW OF PAPERS AND DUTY OF CANDOR

I/We hereby state that I/we have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I/We acknowledge the duty to disclose to the United States Patent Office all information which is known to be material to patentability of this application as defined in § 1.56 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

PRIORITY CLAIM

I/We hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, § 119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate or of any PCT international application(s) designating at least one country other than the United States of America listed below and have also identified below any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate or any PCT international application(s) designating at least one country other than the United States of America filed by me/us on the same subject matter having a filing date before that of the application(s) of which priority is claimed.

**EARLIEST FOREIGN APPLICATION(S), IF ANY FILED WITHIN 12 MONTHS
(6 MONTHS FOR DESIGN) PRIOR TO THIS U.S. APPLICATION**

COUNTRY	APPLICATION NO.	DATE OF FILING (day, month, year)	PRIORITY CLAIMED UNDER 37 USC 119
Australian	2003906026	November 3, 2003	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Australian	2003906361	November 19, 2003	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Australian	2004903440	June 24, 2004	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Australian	2004905662	September 24, 2004	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

**ALL FOREIGN APPLICATION(S), IF ANY FILED MORE THAN 12 MONTHS
(6 MONTHS FOR DESIGN) PRIOR TO THIS U.S. APPLICATION**

☐ I/We hereby claim the benefit, under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), of any United States provisional application(s) listed below.

Application Number(s)	Filing Date (MM/DD/YY)	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional provisional application numbers are listed on a supplemental priority data sheet PTO/SB/02B attached hereto.

DECLARATION

I/We hereby declare that all statements made herein of my/our own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Full name of sole or first joint inventor: Igor Lvovich SKRYABIN*

Inventor's signature: [Signature] Date: 17 January 2009

Post Office Address: 76 Schlich Street, Yarralumla, ACT 2600, Australia

Residence: Same as Above Country of Citizenship: AU

* This declaration is accompanied by an attached statement consisting of 5 pages

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 26 2009

In re Patent Application of
Application No
Int. Filing Date:
For:

Skryabin et al
10/577,971
03 November 2004
Multilayered photovoltaic device on
envelope surface

17 January 2009

The Commissioner for Patents
US Patents and Trademarks Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313 -1450

Dear Sir or Madam:

This statement is to clarify some matters in relation to the execution of the
inventor's declaration.

My declaration does not include or imply granting a power of attorney in
favor of Mr. Michael J. Bujold, of Davis, Bujold and Daniels.

My declaration also does not include or imply granting a power of attorney
in favor of Mr. Wood-Roe, currently of Adams Pluck.

The reasons were presented in my emailed letter of 23 April 2008 to Mr.
Bujold in which, as an inventor and an assignee, I asked Mr. Bujold to file
the letter along with the declaration. My email to Mr. Bujold of 23 April 08
follows.



Dr. Igor Skryabin
76 Schlich St
Yarralumla
ACT 2600
Ph: 61 2 62828487
Email (preferred): iskryabin@gmail.com

1 of 5

Igor Skryabin

From: Igor Skryabin [iskryabin@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 April 2008 1:36 PM
To: 'Mike Bujold'
Subject: RE: US Patent Appln. No 10/577,971/ Your letter of 11 April 2008, your ref: ADAPLU
PO3 AUS
Attachments: Bujold 23 Apr08 envelope.pdf; Declaration envelope signed 23 Apr08.pdf

Dear Mr. Bujold,

Further to my previous email I attach a copy of a declaration and a statement , which I request you to file in relation to the abovementioned patent application
Yours truly,

Igor Skryabin

Dr Igor Skryabin
76 Schlich St
Yarralumla ACT 2600

2 of 5

23 April 2008

Michael J Bujold
Davis & Bujold, PLLC
112 Pleasant Street,
Concord, New Hampshire,
USA, 0331-2931

RE: Igor Lvovich Skryabin et al
US Patent Appln. No 10/577,971
Multilayered photovoltaic device on envelope surface
Your Ref: ADAPLU PO3 AUS

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter of 11 April 2008. I confirm that I am unable to give power of attorney for the reasons explained in the statement below.

Further, as you would appreciate, prior to signing a declaration I, as an inventor, need to ensure that all documents that I reviewed are correct to the best of my knowledge. For some time I have been asking Ms. Sylvia Tulloch, who is named an inventor on the application, and Dyesol Ltd and Sustainable Technologies International Pty Ltd (now Dyesol Industries Pty Ltd) to provide information in relation to Ms. Sylvia Tulloch's inventive contribution. On 22 April, Freehills lawyers, acting for Dyesol Ltd and Dyesol Industries Pty Ltd, informed me that their client "has satisfied itself that the inventors are correctly named on the relevant patent applications". I understand that the "inventors" include Ms. Sylvia Tulloch. Notwithstanding that I had asked for and would have preferred some details of her inventive contribution I consider, based on the statement provided by Freehills, that this obstacle to executing my declaration is now removed.

The reasons for not executing the power attorney are as follows:

1. In a number of letters sent to your firm I requested that you prevent any misrepresentation of my position, as regards the USPTO, from arising. You, however, selected to disregard my requests.
2. In relation to US Patent Application No 10/570,530, Skryabin et.al, Combined photoelectrochemical cell and capacitor:
Notwithstanding my requests and without informing me, your firm filed an incorrect statement of facts in relation to US Patent application No 10/570,530. This statement of facts prepared by the Australian Patent attorney Mr. Lorne Wood-Roes on request of Sustainable Technologies International Pty Ltd (now Dyesol Industries Pty Ltd) contained statements wrong in fact and disparaged my name. In particular, it was stated that:
 - a. Igor Skryabin was dismissed from the Assignee Company Sustainable Technologies International Pty Ltd (STI) in about November 2005 due to unacceptable work performance
 - b. Igor Skryabin was an in-house intellectual property officer.In relation to item 2.a: I explained that I was not dismissed either by STI or Dyesol and that at no time was my work performance unacceptable. Further, by allowing such statement, your clients Dyesol Ltd and Dyesol Industries Pty Ltd breached the terms of my deed with them.

3 of 5

In relation to item 2b: The duties of assisting the company in preparing and filing patent applications were but a part of my responsibilities. As the Technical Manager and Technical Executive of STI I was responsible for the development of Dye Solar Cell technology. Up to date I received no apology from you or your clients Dyesol Ltd and Dyesol Industries Pty Ltd. Further, no statement was filed by you or your clients to rectify all the mistakes in the statement of facts filed in relation to US Patent Application No 10/570,530.

3. I and my solicitors diligently attempted to resolve the matter with Dyesol Ltd during approximately 2 years now. It may appear from the past conduct of your firm and Dyesol Ltd that, instead of addressing the issues, there were attempts to create a sufficient, in the view of your client, substance for a USPTO petition. In other words, your firm and your client appeared to be acting in a manner calculated to create a 'dispute', build up costs and to then use the costs as a threat in a subsequent round of discussions.
4. In relation to US Patent Application No 10/583,121, Skryabin et al, Method for electrochemical engineering of nanoparticulate layers:
In your petition filed on October 15, 2007, among other things, you failed to correctly clarify "the disagreements between the parties", in particular, you failed to acknowledge that Dyesol Ltd was in receipt of my offer of September 18, 2007, in which I agreed to sign all required patent documents, if Dyesol Ltd releases me from all costs which it may allege against me in relation to those patents. This was important since, as explained in the item 4 above, Dyesol Ltd are attempting to make me responsible for their alleged additional costs in relation to prosecution of the US patent applications. Further, you took liberty in not including important documents that I attached to a letter you used to justify your statement.
5. In relation to US Patent Application No 11/629,723, Skryabin et.al, Photovoltaic module with full utilisation of surface area:
On 20 Feb 08 you sent me a letter, in which you offered to answer my inquiries. I called you and sent a number of emails (included below) in yet another attempt to resolve the issues. You responded to none.

12 March 08, to: 'mbujold@davisandbujold.com'

Dear Michael,

I refer to my email of 5 March 2008 and to our telephone conversation on the same day. Still, I have not received the information I asked for from you and I have not received anything from Ms. Tulloch. You mentioned that the deadline for the submission of the documents to the USPTO is quickly approaching. Could you please let me know the date? I am sure you would appreciate that in the circumstances when there were incorrect statements in the previous petitions submitted by your firm to the USPTO, I am unable to give you a power of attorney unless these statements are corrected to represent actual facts of this matter. I accept, however, if there is a pressure of time, that we at least commence the process of such correction in a good faith; receiving copies of your previous petitions is an essential part of this.

I look forward to receiving your reply. In case of urgency I could send the documents to you or directly to the USPTO by couriers, fax or by any other available means in order to meet the USPTO deadline.

Best regards, Igor

Dr. Igor Skryabin

76 Schlich St, Yarralumla, ACT 2600

Australia

Tel: 61 2 62828487

Cell: 61 414721434

5 March 2008, to: 'mbujold@davisandbujold.com'

Dear Michael,

Following our telephone conversation today I confirm that I am waiting for a response from Dyesol (some time ago I contacted Mr. Richard Caldwell, the company's Chairman; he expressed a willingness to discuss, but yet to come back to me with the date of the meeting) and from Sylvia Tulloch (named an inventor on the application). As discussed, I have always been willing to quickly proceed with the matter, it is a subject to a few clarifications in relation to the patent, and I am actively seeking these from Dyesol. I am unsure how I can speed up this process.

4 of 5

Unfortunately, as it became apparent, you were not informed about this. Sadly, this resulted in inaccurate presentations of facts in your petitions to the USPTO.

I confirm that in any case I shall send you my formal reply by 15 March 08. In a meantime, please copy to me your previous petitions to the USPTO as requested in my email of 3 March 2008.

Best regards, Igor

3 March 2008, to: 'mbujold@davisandbujold.com'

Dear Mr. Bujold,

In relation to your letter of 20 February 2008, I am awaiting for clarification regarding inventorship from Ms. Sylvia Tulloch, who is named as an inventor in the patent application in question. I shall respond to you by 15 March 2008. In the meantime:

1. Please avoid filing any further petition to the USPTO to avoid misrepresentation of facts as happened previously.
2. Please copy me any petitions that you have already submitted to the USPTO concerning me.

Yours truly,

Dr. Igor Skryabin
76 Schlich St
Yarralumla
ACT 2600

I believe I have given a sufficient explanation as to why at the moment I cannot allow you (Davis Bujold & Daniels) to act on my behalf before the USPTO. If, however, you are prepared to move on in accordance with principles outlined in my email message of 5 March 2008, I will be prepared to reconsider this decision.

Yours sincerely,



Dr Igor Skryabin

5 of 5